

U.S. v. AVX Original Litigation Document

March 17, 1976

Mr. Ray E. Thompson
Sanitary Engineer
Environmental Protection Agency
240 Highland Avenue
Needham Heights, Mass. 02194

Dear Ray:

We appreciate the receipt of the EPA analytical results from samples which you had collected on January 14 and 15 of this year. As you and I discussed on the telephone today, the absence of Aroclor 1016 in your north trough and sanitary waste samples was surprising to us and could be interpreted as us having achieved zero Aroclor 1016 discharge. As also mentioned, both of our identical samples which we submitted to Woodson-Tennent and New England Analytical & Testing Laboratory were analyzed as containing Aroclor 1016 in addition to Aroclor 1254. Since we have not used Aroclor 1242 since 1971 and have not used Aroclor 1254 for some time now, the PPB you show for these two compounds would be highly indicative of residual effects from these discontinued compounds.

Following is a comparison of our Woodson-Tennent and N.E.A.T. January 14 north trough analytical results as compared with the EPA results:

DATE	LOCATION	<u>EPA</u>			<u>WOODSON TENNETT</u>		<u>N.E.A.T.</u>	
		1016	1242	1254	1016	1254	1016	1254
1/14/76	North Trough	--	42 PPB	8.6	5.20*	2.97*	24.1	3.01
1/15/76	"	--	24	4.6	no samples		submitted	
1/14/76	San. Waste	--	370	31	"	"	"	"
1/15/76	"	--	69	2.8	"	"	"	"
1/15/76	Inc. city water	2.4	--	--	"	"	"	"

The 2.4 PPB of Aroclor 1016 in our incoming water is also surprising since if we detect 1016 there we should also detect it in both the north trough and sanitary waste discharges at somewhat the same level.

If you receive any further information from your analytical people we would appreciate it if you let us know.

Mr. Ray E. Thompson

-2-

March 17, 1976

- * Originally analyzed as 6.63 PPB of 1242 and 1254 @ 2.28 PPB and reanalyzed at our request.


Norman Butterworth

Manager Environmental Control

NB/gd

cc: J. Hutzler
P. Teeple
C. Tuttle